

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 3-6 are now present in this application.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled and new claim 6 has been added.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claim 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,570,689 to Kushita (hereinafter "Kushita"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As noted above, independent claim 1 positively recites a wireless equipment connection system comprising, *inter alia* a first terminal provided with a first Bluetooth module for performing short-distance wireless communication by using Bluetooth and a first control unit for starting said first Bluetooth module; and a second terminal provided with a second Bluetooth module for performing short-distance wireless communications by using Bluetooth and a second control unit for starting said second blue tooth module, and wherein said holder includes a charge interface for supplying a charging current to said first terminal when said first terminal is set to said holder, said first terminal includes a charge detector for detecting whether or not the charging current is supplied thereto from said holder, and said first control unit of said first terminal starts the first Bluetooth module when said charge detector detects that the charging current is supplied to said first terminal so as to establish a wireless connection between said first terminal and said second terminal as required by independent claim 1.

Applicant submits that, in dramatic contrast to the claimed invention, none of the asserted references, whether taken alone or in combination, at least teach, disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, including the features identified above. That is, as best understood, there is simply nothing in Kushita or Lilja or Odinak that remotely suggest the structure of a first Bluetooth module and a second Bluetooth module and further wherein the first and second Bluetooth modules cooperate and interact as set forth above with regards to claim 1. These claimed features are amply supported by the embodiments disclosed in the specification. For example, see page 5, lines 16-22 of the originally filed specification.

With regards to Kushita, and as far as Kushita is understood, it appears that Kushita is specifically directed to a system employing an infrared communication based processing system. See, for example, column 4, lines 18-37. As such, and for the reasons set forth above, it appears that Kushita clearly teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention and as such, Applicant's claimed invention with regards to at least claims 1 and 2, as applied to Kushita, is clearly distinguishable over any disclosure found within Kushita.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Kushita fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements recited by at least amended claim 1. As such, claim 1 is clearly patentable. Because claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1, claims 3 and 5 are at least patentable by virtue of dependency from claim 1 as well as their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under section 102 to Kushita is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kushita in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,640 to Lilja (hereinafter "Lilja"), and rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kushita and Lilja in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/00966441 to Odinak (hereinafter "Odinak"), and rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kushita in view of Odinak.

These rejections are respectfully traversed with regards to claims 4 and 5 and rendered moot as to claim 2 based on its cancellation. However, for completeness, new claim 6 will be addressed in regards to the Examiner's application of Kushita in view of Lilja to claim 2.

With regards to new claim 6, and the similarity with regards to the patentable subject matter found in independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that new claim 6 which has incorporated some of the subject matter of originally filed claim 2, is not rendered obvious in view of the combination of Kushita and Lilja. More specifically, Lilja fails to provide what is lacking in Kushita to render obvious any of Applicant's claims. Additionally, with regards to claim 4 which as amended depends from new claim 6, claim 4 is also clearly distinguishable over the combination of Kushita and Lilja in view of Odinak for at least the same reasons as

discussed above with regards to new claim 6, as well as the fact that Odinak fails to provide what is lacking from Kushita and Lilja. Specifically, it appears that Lilja generally discusses an electrical interface usable with radio frequency transceivers and personal communication devices. In addition, Odinak as understood, generally describes an in-vehicle, embedded personal mobile phone interface and connection that operates with the subscribers wireless network and specifically communicates with the secure feature of a mobile subscriber identification number operating over a wireless network authority.

It should be noted, that Odinak is clearly distinguishable from a Bluetooth connection based on a long list of alleged Bluetooth shortcomings that Odinak's system allegedly corrects or improves upon. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Odinak whether combined with Kushita and Lilja or singularly combined with Kushita, would not be relied upon to arrive at any of the patentable features discussed in the Bluetooth technology of the instant application. In fact, one of ordinary skill in the art if relying upon Odinak, would be directed away from any such Bluetooth enabled technology or feature. That is to say, that Odinak clearly teaches away from any of the inventive aspects or advantages of Applicant's claimed invention.

Therefore, with regards to claims 4 and 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Kushita, Lilja and Odinak or the combination of Kushita and Odinak, fail to render obvious the claimed invention with regards to at least claims 4 and 5, and accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the section 103 rejection of claims 4 and 5 under the combination of Kushita, Lilja and Odinak with the respect of 4 and Kushita and Odinak with respect to 5.

III. Conclusion.

All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which

Application No. 10/810,903
Amendment dated October 4, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2007


Docket No.: 1163-0502PUS1

the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  46463
Michael K. Mutter *William R. Romb*
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant